REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. Claims 22-32 were withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1-21 are rejected. Through this Amendment and Response, claim 1 has been amended. No new matter has been introduced into the application. As explained in more detail below, Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request such action.

Interview Summary

This Interview Summary is filed further to the Examiner's Interview conducted on September 22, 2006.

The patent owner's representatives wish to thank Examiner Homayounmehr for the personal interview on September 22, 2006, during which the pending claims were discussed. During the interview, the patent owner's representatives and the Examiner discussed claim 1 and the art of record, specifically U.S. Patent No. 6,678,827 to Rothermel.

Examiner Homayounmehr indicated he interpreted the teachings of Rothermel to read on the limitation "a security policy written in a security protocol independent security policy language" since, as explained in more detail below in responding to the 35 USC 102 rejection, Rothermel states that a Linux OS system could be replaced with another OS. All parties, however, agreed that Rothermel did not mention or suggest a security policy that is configurable to be simultaneously implemented for a plurality of computer devices within the distributed security system, wherein at least a first computer device within the distributed security system operates on an operating platform that supports at least one security protocol that is different than a security protocol supported by a platform of at least a second computer device among the plurality of computer devices. The Applicants further agreed to consider amending the claims to more clearly recite this aspect.

As explained in more detail below, the claims presented in this Response recite subject matter that is not taught, disclosed, or suggested in Rothermel.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102

Claims 1, 2, 3, and 5 to 19 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Rothermel (U.S. Patent No. 6,678,827). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection in view of the Remarks below.

As discussed in the previous Office Action and during the Interview conducted on September 22, 2006 the Examiner notes that the Linux OS as disclosed in Rothermel could be replaced with another OS, such as Windows NT operation system, which has different security protocols and therefore believes that each different implementation could utilize a security policy written in a security protocol independent security policy language, albeit a different one.

As discussed above, the Applicants respectfully submit there is no mention or suggestion in Rothermel of a security policy that is configurable to be simultaneously implemented for a plurality of computer devices within the distributed security system, wherein at least a first computer device within the distributed security system operates on an operating platform that supports at least one security protocol that is different than a security protocol supported by a platform of at least a second computer device among the plurality of computer devices. As one example in the Specification:

> Windows NT operating systems has 32 defined permission rights. With the present invention, the administrator can define new rights by defining or editing a security policy. The secuirty policy may be capability based, i.e, an application may define a capability and virtual distributed security system 202 may provide that capability.

(Spec.; page 7, paragraph 27). As indicated in paragraph 6 of the present application, the security protocol independent security framework as recited can support multiple cryptographic technologies and by abstracting the technologies "does not require applications to be aware of the cryptographic technologies being used". (Spec.; page 7, paragraph 53). Moreover, as indicated in paragraph 43 of the present application, abstracting underlying protocols facilitates interoperability with other systems. Thus, the distributed security system as currently recited can incorporate a security policy that may be simultenouesly implemented across different platforms that support different protocols and cryptographic techniques.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Claims 2, 3, and 5 to 19 ultimately depend from claim 1 and are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

Claims 4, 20, and 21 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rothermel as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Saulpaugh (U.S. Patent No. 6,850,979).

Claims 4, 20 and 21 each ultimately depend from claim 1 and are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

New Claims 33 and 34

New independent claim 33 is directed towards a method of utilizing a security policy. Claim 33 recites a security policy written in a security protocol independent security policy language implemented within a distributed computing system, wherein the distributed computing system comprises at least a first computer device operating on a first operating platform and at least a second computer device operating on a second operating platform that supports at least one security protocol that is different than a security protocol supported by a platform of the first computer device. Further, the claim sets forth that the security policy is configured to allow the first computer device and the second computer device to simultaneously process data in accordance with the security policy of the distributed security system. As discusses above in relation to the rejected claims, this is not taught or otherwise suggested by the art of record.

New independent claim 34 is directed towards a computer readable medium having computer-executable instructions that when executed apply a security policy within a distributed computing system having at least a first computer device operating on a first operating platform and at least a second computer device operating on a second operating platform that supports at least one security protocol that is different than a security protocol supported by a platform of the first computer device, wherein the security policy is written in a security protocol independent security policy language. The claim further recites the permitting of the security policy to be simultaneously implemented for a plurality of computer devices within the distributed security

system including at least the first computer device and the second computer device. As discusses above in relation to the rejected claims, this is not taught or otherwise suggested by the art of record. The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request allowance of claims 33 and 34.

CONCLUSION

The claims as now presented are believed to be in allowable condition. No new matter has been introduced into the application. In light of the above arguments, applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application and allowance of all pending claims. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned should it be deemed necessary to facilitate prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 28, 2006   By: _____

Shawn P. Gorman
Registration No. 56,197
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
10 S. Wacker Drive
Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606-7407
Telephone: 312-463-5000
Facsimile: 312-463-5001